

REMARKS:Claim Objection

Claim 36 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claim 36 has been amended to recite the limitation that the first and second elements are connection elements of a quick connect type connector. Support for this amendment is found on p. 11, lines 7-20 and FIGS. 7A-C. Withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 USC 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-29, 34 and 35

Claims 27-29, 34 and 35 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda (US6020559).

Claim 27 has been amended to require that the first and second electrical contacts are positioned towards the first end of the sheath, and are also positioned on opposite sides of the sheath. Support for this amendment is found in FIGS. 2, 4A-5B and related description. As discussed in detail in the specification, the presence of multiple contacts towards one end of the cable results in much improved reliability, both during testing and in the final product in which the cable is implemented.

In contrast, Maeda fails to show multiple contacts on the same conductor, the contacts positioned towards the same end, yet positioned on opposite sides of the sheath. Rather, FIGS. 10 and 12 show the contacts 54 on the same side of the cable, but nowhere does Maeda disclose or suggest positioning of the contacts on opposite sides of the cable. Nor does the rejection point to a particular place in Maeda disclosing or suggesting oppositely positioned contacts.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Similarly, claim 29 further requires that the electrical contacts be positioned directly opposite each other. Nowhere does Maeda disclose this configuration.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 has been amended to require that the first and second electrical contacts, both positioned towards the same end of the sheath, are exposed portions of the conductor. Support for this amendment is found in FIGS. 4B, 5B and related discussion. Claim 30, which now depends from claim 28, further requires that the exposed portions of the conductor are substantially coplanar with the outer surface of the sheath, as shown in FIGS. 4B, 5B. Using exposed conductor as the contacts makes the cable less expensive to fabricate, as addition of contact pads is not needed. Further, errors that could occur during addition of pads is eliminated. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 28 and 30 is respectfully requested.

Claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 27, and therefore incorporate the limitations of claim 27. Because claim 27 is believed to be allowable, claims 34 and 35 are also believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 34 and 35 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 36

Claims 27 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Noro et al. (US6384432).

Claim 27, as amended, requires that the first and second electrical contacts, positioned on the same conductor towards the first end of the sheath, do not extend beyond the first end of the sheath. In contrast, Noro's conductors extend beyond the end of the sheath. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 depends from claim 37, and therefore incorporates the limitations of claim 37. Claim 37 is believed to be allowable over Noro, as Noro fails to teach or suggest electrical contacts on opposite sides of the sheath. Thus, claim 36 is also believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Claim 37

Claim 37 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Balzano (US5691509).

Claim 37 has been amended to require that the first and second electrical contacts be positioned towards the same end of the sheath, and are also positioned on opposite sides of the sheath as shown in FIGS. 2 and 4A-5B.

In contrast, Balzano's dual connectors 15a, 15b are always positioned on the same side of the cable. Note col. 2, lines 36-42 of Balzano.

Claims 30-33

Claims 30-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Balzano.

Claim 30, which depends from claims 27 and 28, now requires that the first and second electrical contacts extend through and be substantially coplanar with the sheath. In contrast, neither Maeda nor Balzano disclose such a feature. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 has been amended to require that the first and second electrical contacts for each conductor are aligned along a common plane. An example of this is shown in FIG. 1 of the present application, where the plane is generally parallel to the nearest end of the cable. Because claim 31 depends from claim 27, and claim 27 is believed to be allowable over both Maeda and Balzano, claim 31 is believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 31 is respectfully requested.

Claim 32 has been amended to require that the first and second electrical contacts are adapted for compression coupling. Because claim 32 depends from claim 27, and claim 27 is believed to be allowable over both Maeda and Balzano, claim 32 is believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 32 is respectfully requested.

Claim 33 has been amended to require that the oppositely-positioned contacts are offset from each other. As mentioned in the previous sections, neither Maeda nor Balzano disclose such a feature.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 971-2573. For payment of any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 09-0466 (Order No. SJO9-2003-0032US1).

Respectfully submitted,

By:  Date: 2/14/05
Dominic M. Kotab
Reg. No. 42,762

Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, California 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 971-2573
Facsimile: (408) 971-4660

IBM1P040/SJO9-2003-0032US1

- 12 -